



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,397	12/10/2001	Sunao Sakamoto	111090	8275
25944	7590	07/11/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			GUILL, RUSSELL L	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2123		

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/006,397	SAKAMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner Russell L. Guill	Art Unit 2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2001.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 - 18 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1 - 18 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/10/01, 4/4/03</u>	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 18 have been examined. Claims 1 – 18 have been rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 - 4, 6 and 8 - 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson (U.S. Patent 6,327,551) in view of common knowledge in the art.

3.1. Peterson teaches:

3.1.1. a method of designing a product with the aid of a computer (Abstract); Registering and storing design-related requirement information (figure 1, element 2; and column 28, lines 13 – 22; and figure 13a, element 600; and column 6, lines 55 - 58); preparing design specifications of the product (figure 1, element 3); retrieving requirement information relating to the prepared design specifications, from the design-related requirement information (figure 1, element 9); presenting a content of the retrieved requirement information to a designer (figure 1, elements 9 and 3; it would have been obvious that the content is presented to a designer in order to perform design); allowing the designer to check a content of the requirement information presented (figure 1, element 3, sub-element labeled “VALIDATION” ), and create detailed design information based on the design specifications (figure 1, element 10).

3.1.2. Acquiring, upon occurrence of a problem in design, information about the problem and information about a solution to the problem, as the requirement information, and registering the acquired requirement information (figure 1, elements 3, 16, 2, 4 and 17; and column 6, lines 2 – 5; and column 6, lines 18 – 21; it would have been obvious to acquire, upon occurrence of a problem in design, information about the problem and information about a solution to the problem).

3.1.3. Determining that the problem has occurred when a design change is required in an evaluation stage in which the detailed design information is evaluated (figure 1, element 4, sub-element labeled “VALIDATION”; and column 6, lines 1 – 5, and lines 10 – 12).

3.1.4. Presenting the design specifications to at least one evaluating person in charge of design evaluation, prior to creation of the detailed design information by the designer (figure 1, element 3, sub-element labeled “VALIDATION”; it would have been obvious that validation is performed by at least one person in charge of design evaluation); and acquiring information about design-related requests made by the at least one evaluating person based on the design specifications presented, as the requirement information, and registering the acquired requirement information (figure 1, element 3, sub-element labeled “VALIDATION” and element 16; it would have been obvious to acquire information about design-related requests made by the at least one evaluating person based on the design specifications presented).

3.1.5. Storing information about the design specification of the product (column 6, lines 55 – 58; and figure 1, element 3).

3.1.6. Retrieving the information about the design specifications of the product and presenting the design specifications to at least one evaluating person in charge of design evaluation, prior to creation of the detailed design information by the designer (figure 1, element 3, sub-element

labeled "VALIDATION"; it would have been obvious that validation is performed by at least one person in charge of design evaluation);

3.2. Peterson does not specifically teach:

3.2.1. Registering and storing design-related requirement information in a server as an electronic file created in a predetermined format; causing the server to automatically retrieve requirement information relating to the prepared design specifications, from the design-related requirement information stored in the server; presenting a content of the automatically retrieved requirement information to a designer via the server.

3.2.2. Acquiring, upon occurrence of a problem in design, information about the problem and information about a solution to the problem, as the requirement information, and registering the acquired requirement information in the server as an electronic file of the predetermined format.

3.2.3. Acquiring information about design-related requests made by the at least one evaluating person based on the design specifications presented, as the requirement information, and registering the acquired requirement information in the server as an electronic file of the predetermined format.

3.2.4. Storing information about the design specification of the product server as an electronic file in a predetermined format.

3.2.5. Retrieving the information about the design specifications of the product from the server and presenting the design specifications to at least one evaluating person in charge of design evaluation, prior to creation of the detailed design information by the designer.

3.3. Official Notice is taken that it was common knowledge to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to:

3.3.1. Store information in a server as an electronic file created in a predetermined format;

3.3.2. Cause a server to automatically retrieve information stored in the server;

3.3.3. Automatically present information retrieved via the server;

3.4. The motivation to use common knowledge in the art with the art of Peterson would have been the benefit of automating the method of designing a product for improved accuracy, control, and speed of execution. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use common knowledge in the art with the art of Peterson to produce the claimed inventions.

4. **Claims 5, 7 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson (U.S. Patent 6,327,551) and common knowledge in the art, in view of Hair (U.S. Patent 6,292,707).

4.1. **Regarding claim 10**, Peterson does not specifically teach that requirement information includes information that is useful in designing in general.

4.2. **Regarding claim 10**, Hair teaches that requirement information includes information that is useful in designing in general (*column 2, lines 30 – 55*).

4.3. **Regarding claims 5 and 7**, Peterson does not specifically teach that the evaluating person comprises at least one member selected from a manufacturing division, a test division and a parts manufacturer.

4.4. **Regarding claims 5 and 7**, Hair teaches that the evaluating person comprises a member selected from a manufacturing division (*column 2, lines 23 – 30*).

4.5. The motivation to use the art of Hair with the art of Peterson would have been the benefits recited in Hair of providing a process by which a product may be produced with minimum cost and highest quality while reducing the time to market (*column 1, lines 39 – 45*). Therefore, as discussed

above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Hair with the art of Peterson to produce the claimed invention.

5. **Claims 11, 13, 14 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson (U.S. Patent 6,327,551) in view of Burbridge (U.S. Patent 6,868,370).

5.1. Peterson teaches:

5.1.1. A system for assisting creation of detailed design information based on design specifications (figure 1, especially elements 1 – 4 and 8 – 10 and 15 – 17);

5.1.2. design-related requirement information that is recorded (figure 1, elements 2 and 3);

5.1.3. retrieving the design-related requirement information relating to the design specifications, and presenting a content of the retrieved information (figure 1, elements 9 and 3; **it would have been obvious that the content is presented to a designer in order to perform design**);

5.1.4. wherein the requirement information includes information about a design-related problem which is acquired upon occurrence of the problem, and information about a solution to the design-related problem (figure 1, elements 3, 16 and 2, and element 3, sub-element labeled “VALIDATION”; and column 6, lines 1 – 5, and lines 10 – 12).

5.1.5. Wherein the requirement information further includes information about design-related requests made by at least one evaluating person in charge of design evaluation based on the design specification presented to the at least one evaluating person (figure 1, elements 3, 16 and 2, and element 3, sub-element labeled “VALIDATION”; and column 6, lines 1 – 5, and lines 10 – 12).

5.2. Peterson does not specifically teach:

- 5.2.1. A server that manages transmission of information via a computer network;
- 5.2.2. *A first database provided under control of the server, the first database containing design-related requirement information that is recorded as an electronic file in a predetermined format;*
- 5.2.3. *Wherein the server automatically retrieves the design-related requirement information relating to the design specifications from the first database, and presents a content of the retrieved information to a user;*
- 5.2.4. Wherein the requirement information includes information that is useful in designing in general.

5.3. Burbridge teaches:

- 5.3.1. A server that manages transmission of information via a computer network (figure 1, especially elements 12, 14, and 20; and column 5, lines 8 – 32).
- 5.3.2. A first database provided under control of the server, the first database containing design-related requirement information that is recorded as an electronic file in a predetermined format (column 1, lines 45 – 50);
- 5.3.3. Wherein the server automatically retrieves the design-related requirement information from the first database, and presents a content of the retrieved information to a user (column 2, lines 50 – 60).

5.4. The motivation to use the art of Burbridge with the art of Peterson would have been the benefit recited in Burbridge that the system provides access to data simultaneously, and allows changes to data through remote access, and handles large volumes of documents (Burbridge, column 1, lines 45 – 55). Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at

the time of invention to use the art of Burbridge with the art of Peterson to produce the claimed invention.

6. **Claim 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson (U.S. Patent 6,327,551) and Burbridge (U.S. Patent 6,868,370), further in view of Thackston (U.S. Patent 6,295,513).

6.1. Peterson does not specifically teach:

6.1.1. A second database provided under control of the server, the second database containing information about the design specifications that is recorded as an electronic file in a predetermined format.

6.2. Thackston teaches:

6.2.1. A second database provided under control of a server, the second database containing information about the design specifications that is recorded as an electronic file in a predetermined format (figure 2, items 210; and figure 3, elements 210 and 335; and figure 8, elements 335 and 865 and 892).

6.3. The motivation to use the art of Thackston with the art of Peterson would have been Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Burbridge with the art of Peterson to produce the claimed invention.

7. **Claims 15, 17 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson (U.S. Patent 6,327,551) and Burbridge (U.S. Patent 6,868,370), in view of Hair (U.S. Patent 6,292,707).

7.1. Peterson does not specifically teach:

7.1.1. Regarding claims 15 and 17, the at least one evaluating person comprises at least one member selected from a manufacturing division, a test division and a parts manufacturer.

7.1.2. Regarding claim 18, that requirement information includes information that is useful in designing in general.

7.2. Regarding claims 15 and 17, Hair teaches that the evaluating person comprises a member selected from a manufacturing division (*column 2, lines 23 – 30*).

7.3. Regarding claim 18, Hair teaches that requirement information includes information that is useful in designing in general (*column 2, lines 30 – 55*).

7.4. The motivation to use the art of Hair with the art of Peterson would have been the benefits recited in Hair of providing a process by which a product may be produced with minimum cost and highest quality while reducing the time to market (*column 1, lines 39 – 45*). Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Hair with the art of Peterson to produce the claimed invention.

#### *Conclusion*

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell L. Guill whose telephone number is 571-272-7955. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday 9:00 AM – 5:30 PM.
9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on 571-272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group Receptionist: 571-272-2100.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Russ Guill  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2123

RG

  
Paul L. Rodriguez 7/7/05  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2125